Morse's Great Speech In Opposition to the War, Pps. 2-3

The Meat On Which Our Caesar Feeds

"While the President invokes the name of freedom to justify what he has decided to do there [in Vietnam], he is unwilling to see the free institutions of the government he heads operate as they are intended to operate. . . . Why is debate in Congress so feared downtown? Why are cabinet members, and the President's personal advisers sent up to the Hill every time the word gets out that some Member of Congress is thinking of questioning anything about to be done in Asia?"

—Sen. Wayne Morse, in the Senate, May 6.

"In the best of circumstances it is difficult for the powerful to escape the Yes-Man hazard. It is easy for a man to confuse his possession of power with the possession of knowledge . . . pomp and circumstance add to the danger that the executive may believe his own publicity agents. . . . As Robert Lovett has said, 'The only thing more dangerous than an external enemy is a group of home-grown military sycophants'."

—Staff study by the Senate's National Security subcommittee released May 10.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 19 MAY 17, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Forms of Democracy, But No Longer The Reality

The swift and obedient fashion with which Congress rubber stamped Lyndon Johnson's moves toward wider war in two hemispheres recalls those pages in which Gibbon describes how shrewdly Augustus laid the foundations of Imperial rule in Rome. Caesar's heir was scrupulous in maintaining the forms of the Republic. Augustus sat in the Senate and affected merely to be the first among equals. He and his successors "consulted the great national council, and *seemed* to refer to its decision the most important concerns of peace and war." The italics are Gibbon's. It was only later, after the murder of Caligula, that "the dream of liberty" came to an end "and the Senate awoke to all the horrors of inevitable servitude." Then, as the scene darkens, in another parallel we should take to heart, the Caesars woke up to find themselves at the mercy of the Empire's overgrown armies. These began by extinguishing liberty abroad and ended by crushing it at home. A new race of "polished and eloquent" sycophants "inculcated the duty of passive obedience, and descanted on the inevitable mischiefs of freedom." Pick up almost any newspaper and you may read Johnson's little court of columnists preaching the same doctrines today.

Must Everybody Bear His Brand?

The way the President's $700,000,000 appropriation for Vietnam was put through the Congress bore the earmarks of a master manipulator. The money by his own admission was not needed; what he wanted was a blank check of authority to widen the war as he saw fit. He could have asked such authority directly. But then the resolution would have been a naked request for war powers and it would have had to go through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Its chairman, Fulbright, and at least eight other of its members have grown critical of the expanding war. The grant of power was wrapped in a request for military funds so it would pass through the less critical Senate Appropriations Committee and because it is difficult to vote against supplies for troops on the firing line. This is a measure the consequence of which may be war with China. Yet it was approved by the House within 24 hours after 75 minutes of discussion, with less than 15 minutes allowed to the opposition. In the Senate, the bill was rushed through in the same fashion, with only five hours allowed for debate. The 408-7 vote in the House and the 88-3 vote in the Senate resembled a stampede of steers in Texas. An arrogant, aggressive and compulsively possessive man has put his LBJ brand on the Congress as he has on his family and retainers.

Only three Senators, Morse, Gruening and Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, voted "no." Many of those who voted "yes" indicated their misgiving. But fear of White House displeasure proved stronger. As we begin the descent into what may become one of history's greatest catastrophes, political cowardice won out over conscience. Even Stennis of Mississippi, who was floor manager for the Administration, admitted after Morse's great speech in opposition (see pps. 2-3) that Morse was "brilliant" and had raised "some serious points." Not a single Democrat rose to protest when Morse said Johnson was following Goldwater's course. Four Republicans ex-

(Continued on Page Four)

Look Again, Mr. Bundy

"You may have noticed the very interesting reports in a French newspaper, L'Express, by a correspondent named Chaffard, who had been with the Viet Cong. . . . There are South Vietnamese who have been recruited into the Viet Cong, very largely by intimidation and terror. A few misguided individuals, some of whom are the titular leaders of the so-called Liberation Front. Nobody ever heard of them in Saigon before."

—Wm. P. Bundy, Ass't Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, on Face The Nation May 9.

"The President of the Front, the chief official of the Viet Cong: Nguyen Huu Tho . . . was not long ago one of the most brilliant lawyers of the Saigon bar. . . . The secretary-general of the FNL is an architect of 50 years, Huynh tan Phat, who represents the 'Democratic Party' on the Central Committee. The principal representative of the Front abroad, residing in Prague, is a former professor and journalist, Nguyen van Hieu, 42 years old, leader of the 'Radical Socialist Party.' Of the five vice presidents of the Front, only one is a Communist."

—Georges Chaffard in* L'Express, *May 2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morse Warns of World Hatred If We Try to Play World Policeman . . .

By Senator Wayne Morse *

Are we really going to take the position that we take it upon ourselves to police the world in regard to Communist revolutions? We have neither the resources nor the manpower for that police job. If we are to act unilaterally on the basis of this statement by the President and this pledge by the House, I warn the American people from my desk in the Senate today that we shall be drained both in blood and in economic power in the decades immediately ahead.

In my judgment, the vote the Senate will cast tomorrow can be described as a vote of destiny for the United States; but it will be a vote of destiny that will start the decline of this Republic, as great powers before us in the history of mankind declined after they too became drunk with military power. I say sadly and solemnly, but out of deep conviction, that today my Government stands before the world drunk with military power. My Government, apparently, has come to the conclusion that because of military power its dictates around the world will have to be obeyed.

What We Cannot Destroy

That power will be challenged, and I believe we are now headed into decades of turmoil and strife. We shall win one military victory after another; we shall destroy cities, industrial installations, and nuclear installations; we shall kill by the millions. But in my judgment, that course of action will lay a foundation of hatred on the part of the colored races of the world against the American people. In due course of time, those installations will be rebuilt, not only on material foundations, but on the foundation of intense hatred by Asians for the people of the United States. That hatred will even be inherited by generations of American boys and girls 50, 75, 100—yes, 200 years from now. It will be a foundation of intense Asiatic hatred that will eventually vent its vengeance upon future generations of American boys and girls.

I am satisfied that there is a growing tide of deep concern on the part of increasing millions of fellow Americans about the mistaken policy that the President and Congress are following by acting outside the framework of international law, making war on a unilateral basis, and killing, killing, and killing human beings who, even though they are enemies, are also children of God Almighty.

Mr. President, I say sadly that, in my judgment, Senators who vote "yea" tomorrow for the joint resolution will have voted for an undeclared war and for the continuation of an undeclared war. They will be voting, in my judgment, for an increased draft. They will be voting for the use of nuclear weapons if the President so desires. They will be voting for thousands and thousands of American casualties in the war that I am satisfied will result on a massive basis if we continue our policy in Asia. They will be voting for all that Goldwater stood for in the recent presidential election.

This administration knows and states, but not publicly, that we cannot defeat Red China with airpower. We cannot defeat Red China with bombings, conventional or nuclear. Therefore, they are preparing to meet Red China on the

* *From Morse's two speeches in the Senate, May 5 and 6.*

Bosch on U.S. Aid to Communism

"Instead of stopping another Cuba, they will make another Cuba," Bosch said. "They say there are 53 known Communists. There are going to be 53,000 Communists in the Dominican Republic because of the Marine intervention, and they will be U.S.-made Communists. I became President in a free election. I ran my Government with democratic methods. I have said many times I have no use for communism. But there are many people in public life in the United States who are afraid of democracy. . . ."

—AP from San Juan in Washington Post, May 9.

Trujillo's Secret Police Chief Scornful of U.S. "Red" Charges in Dominican Revolt

"One of the men who should really know if the revolt in the Dominican Republic is led by Communists is the man who ran that country's secret police force for the corrupt dictator Rafael Trujillo. That job was held in 1957 by Maj.-Gen. Arturo Espaillat, a graduate of West Point who directed a force of 5,000 policemen and spies. . . .

"From Lisbon, where he now lives in exile, Maj.-Gen. Espaillat told me: 'They know damn well that Mr. Bosch is not a Communist. The Americans said that Bosch lost control and that the Communists took over. It's not true. There might have been three or four Communists in the revolt. There always are, all through Latin America. It doesn't mean anything. The U.S. wants some lackey like Donald Reid Cabral they can give orders to. . . . they don't want a man of dignity, a man like Bosch who will not take orders but who will do his own thinking.' . . .

" 'When you were working for Trujillo,' I suggested to Maj.-Gen. Espaillat, 'I suppose you knew about every Communist in the country'."

" 'Oh my God, yes,' he cried. 'I had complete crossfiles on all of them. I would say altogether there were maybe 100'."

—Ron Haggart, Toronto Daily Star columnist, May 6.

"Charges indicating close collaboration between the rebel government and the Communists have produced a storm of controversy here. . . . Pena Gomez, who was listed as one of the rebels present at a meeting of rebel leaders and top Communists that was supposed to have taken place on May 4 denied that such a meeting had been held.

"Particularly controversial was a U.S. statement indicating that three questionable personalities had been given jobs in the new rebel government. Alfredo Conde Pausa, listed as the new Attorney General, was described as 'a known sympathizer with the PSPD (the Communist Dominican Popular Socialist Party).' A supreme court justice for 26 years, Conde Pausa said, weeping, that in the last Presidential election he had voted for the conservative Civic Union Party and that he had worked on the democratic 1963 constitution with U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. . . .

"Luis Homero Lajara Burges, charged with associating with PSPD members, was listed as the new director of the National Department of Investigation, though he held this job in the Molina government and holds no official position now. A naval officer, he is regarded by conservative Dominicans as anti-communist. Lajara's son Alejandro is listed as the third questionable government appointee. . . . However, Alejandro, only 15 years old, holds no official position either."

—Dan Kurzman, in the Wash. Post, May 9.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Calls A Vote for Johnson's Vietnam Bill A Vote for Goldwater' Program

ground, with American troops. How many? To begin with, a minimum of 300,000. As Professor Morgenthau, of Chicago University, said when I lectured at that institution not long ago, we shall have to start with 3 million. Hundreds of thousands will come back to the United States in coffins in the first 18 months.

If China Enters The War

Let me say to my colleagues and from my desk, to the American people today: Continue this escalation, and if Red China moves on the ground and we move in with 300,000 men, plus hundreds of thousands more as that war bogs down, in my judgment, we shall have performed a criminal act against the history of mankind, when it is so unnecessary. Many Members of Congress seem to think he [the President] is doing the best he can, but what he is doing is building up massive world resentment among the very people we have been saying for many years we want to win over to the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, are you ready to tell the American people that if this course of action brings this country into conflict with China, and even possibly Red Russia, you are ready for a nuclear war? Are you ready to fight a nuclear war over the issues that have arisen in Vietnam? I am satisfied that the overwhelming majority of the American people will repudiate you if this is what you are willing to do.

Mr. President, the American people have only one instrument that can prevent a misguided, misadvised, misinformed President from committing an incredible blunder—a blunder that will destroy all the confidence in America that has been built up since World War II—that instrument is the Senate of the United States. But we are not even able to say "go slow," even though I would guess that half or more of the Members of this body know in their minds that the President is wrong.

Let me say to Senators who claim that they intend to be consulted again before there is another escalation of the war: You are being consulted right now. This is the President's consultation. When the President has this consultation under his belt, he is going to announce the landing of thousands more of American troops in Vietnam. When he starts sending those hundreds of thousands of troops into Asia, the moment the Chinese start moving on the ground—that is exactly a part of the war plans—he will cite the pending joint resolution and the resolution of last August which give him that authority.

ADA Supports Morse

"Americans for Democratic Action supports your efforts opposing President's $700 million request for Vietnam. Such funds represent unnecessary authorization and constitute ratification by Senate of expanded conflict which may bring wider war. ADA believes time is right now for full discussion of war in Vietnam in open foreign policy committee hearings before further steps are taken."

—Telegram from Rep. Don Edwards, ADA Chairman, to Sen. Morse, May 6.

Among The Handful Who Spoke Out in The House Against The Vietnamese War Resolution

Rep. John DOW (D., N.Y.): While we hold that the Vietcong uprising is a Communist plot, others hold that it is a rebellion of the people against the rulers. Now there may be places in the world where we should oppose communism —perhaps in Russia or in China. But let us not attempt to do it in those areas where we may be interfering with a revolt of people against oppression. For, if we do this too often, it will be known all over the globe that the common people cannot right their wrongs without U.S. opposition.

Rep. Edith GREEN (D., Ore.): There is a point beyond which credibility simply will not stretch—and it is that somehow by waging a wider war we pursue a policy of peace. This vote represents—in my opinion—a vote for that delusion. . . . The high point of these whole implausible proceedings was the speech of one of my colleagues who —in one breath—demanded withdrawal of Government funds to an educational project because some of the participants criticized Administration policy in Vietnam and then—in the next breath—he admiringly quotes Senator Vandenberg's statement that "every foreign policy must be totally debated, and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs" . . . and this in the context of demanding for himself and others of the minority party a voice in foreign policy decisions. . . . I can see we are all going to have an absorbing year if we follow [this] advice—making certain we don't subsidize free inquiry, but only subsidize thought control.

Rep. John CONYERS (D., Mich.): I question the very basis for our new policy in Vietnam which states that we are dealing not with a civil war, but with aggression by one country against another. . . . All the evidence that has been made available to me indicates that the only realistic appraisal of the situation is that we are participating on one side of a civil war in a particular country. . . .

Rep. George BROWN (D., Cal.): Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my grave doubts about the rightness of what we propose to do here today. I do not say this lightly and without having weighed it long in my heart. . . . But in all good conscience, I must say: Mr. President, you are on the wrong path. You are gambling the welfare—yes, even the existence—of the United States on an illusion—the illusion that liberty, democracy, and the peace of mankind can be won by the slaughter of peasants in Vietnam—the illusion that communists can be defeated by the power of military force alone, regardless of the conditions and circumstances under which that force operates.

Rep. William F RYAN (D., N.Y.): The situation in South Vietnam is not simply a case of aggression from North Vietnam. . . . This fight is also an internal struggle. . . . We cannot bomb people into democracy; nor can we bomb people into negotiations.

Rep. Don EDWARDS (D., Cal.): This effort to force this appropriation through Congress without adequate committee or floor consideration acts to prevent any real dialogue on the pressing foreign policy questions before this Nation. Serious questions have been raised. Are we doing all that can be done to end the war in Vietnam? Did we act properly in the Dominican Republic?

Burton (D., Cal.) also voted 'no' but did not speak.

Rep. John LINDSAY (R., N.Y.): My vote, however, is not to be construed as an approval of the administration's whole policy in Vietnam. . . . I hope the President will recognize that many of us who vote in favor of this resolution do so in the hope that it will contribute, not to the widening of an unwanted war, but to the pursuit of an honorable peace. . . .

—In the House, May 5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will the Kennedy Brothers Provide A Liberal Opposition to LBJ?

(Continued from Page One)

pressed anxiety. Javits objected to "sneaking in" an authorization for combat troops via an appropriation bill; Cooper of Kentucky and Carlson of Kansas urged more effort at negotiations; Aiken of Vermont opposed the bombing of the North. Gore of Tennessee implied that escalation of the war to the North was planned before the Pleiku bombing in February. Church of Idaho, Pell of Rhode Island and Clark of Pennsylvania indicated that they were voting "yes" with reluctance; Clark urged negotiations with the Viet Cong and a gradual cessation of bombing the North.

Bobby and the Reds in Santo Domingo

The surprise of this lopsided "debate" came in its closing moments when Robert Kennedy of New York for the first time spoke out on foreign policy. He said he was voting for the resolution because Senator Stennis had assured the Senate (but very equivocally) that this was "not a blank check." He said he thought "our efforts for peace should continue with the same intensity as our efforts in the military field" and that we had "erred for some time in regarding Vietnam as purely a military problem." He ended by indicating his disagreement with Johnson, too, on the Dominican Republic. "Our determination to stop Communist revolution in the hemisphere must not be construed," Kennedy said, "as opposition to popular uprisings against injustice and oppression just because the targets of such popular uprisings say they are Communist-inspired or Communist-led, *or even because known Communists take part in them.*" The italics are ours. It is not easy to say such things in the present atmosphere. Bobby Kennedy was in the inner circles which ran the Vietnamese war and supported Bosch in the Dominican Republic during his brother's Administration. His criticism is significant. Taken in connection with Teddy Kennedy's leadership in the fight against Johnson on poll taxes, we have here the possible nucleus of a liberal opposition against Johnson. His warmest defenders, notably the Goldwaterite Tower of Texas, came from the Republican side.

But it will take more than a few reservations *sotto voce* to halt the drift toward a big war. Fear of offending the White House was also apparent among those who were silent or absent. Of eight absent Senators, three—Dodd, Smathers and Symington—were recorded in favor of the Johnson resolution. The five others, some of whom have been critical, preferred to go unrecorded. These were Fulbright, Russell, McGovern, Burdick and Metcalf. And Senator Gruening, perhaps to balance off his opposition to Johnson on Vietnam, supported his action in the Dominican Republic. Historians as passionately anti-Castro as Theodore Draper (letter in the *New York Times*, May 12) and Robert J. Alexander (letter in the *New York Times*, May 9) have bitterly rejected Johnson's claim that intervention in Santo Domingo was necessary to prevent a Red take-over. It reflects the nature of the Johnson era that a liberal who has fought all his life against use of the Big Stick in Latin America should feel it politically expedient to endorse it now. *May 12*

How the Propaganda Mills Grind On

"The crux of the situation here seems to be that U.S. officials responsible for giving information to the huge press corps are admittedly 'not being told anything,' and what they are told is, it appears, often false or misleading. And the kind of reporting that is going to the President and his advisers in Washington is also suspect. For example last Monday night the President said, 'Today there are between 1,000 and 1500 dead people whose bodies are in the streets of Santo Domingo, threatening an extreme epidemic.' Reporters, including myself, who have been through the worst parts of the rebel districts, have seen no more than 6 to 10 bodies in the streets at any one time. . . . At the U.S. Embassy, on the night before U.S. Marines occupied the territory that is now called the International Refugee Zone, a group of correspondents was told that 12 anti-rebel Dominicans were lined up against a wall and to cries of 'paredon' (to the wall, the Castroite call) were personally machine-gunned to death by the present rebel leader, Col. Caamano. Not a single reporter has found concrete evidence of the episode. . . ."

—Barnard L. Collier from Santo Domingo in the New York Herald-Tribune, May 8, a dispatch which gives many other examples of official misinformation.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

The 1964 Index Is Ready—You Can Have One Free If You Send a Long Stamped Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

5/17/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

For $5.25 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED